



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

imperfect, it is the Engadine alone that does not stick to the traditional Latin form, *e. g. putreva*. The author has very conveniently arranged all the irregular verbs according to the Latin type; for example, sub *ire, vadere*, we find not only the regular conjugation, but also all the forms collected in the order of person and number, with their numerous equivalents and the dates of their use.

A most valuable supplement, covering twenty-one pages, and a good register end the book. In the former we have placed before us a large number of common words, such as *aqua, bene, bonus, casa, clavis*, and the numerals, running through fifty strictly Raetian and nineteen neighboring dialects. The dialectologist must be fastidious indeed who would not be satisfied with this extraordinary mass of material, where he can study both form and phonetics for almost every shading of every dialect belonging to the group. All moot points touching the language are left unnoticed, and the syntax is not treated at all in this grammar.

A. M. ELLIOTT.

Aeschylus. Prometheus Bound, with Notes and an Introduction, by R. H. MATHER, of Amherst College. Boston, John Allyn, 1883.

No play is better adapted than the Prometheus for use with a class beginning Greek tragedy, and we are prepared to welcome warmly an edition which shall give us the results of the philological study of this play since the publication of President Woolsey's judicious edition, of which the plates now are badly worn. The edition before us contains so much that is good, mainly gathered from different sources, that we hesitate to pronounce it faulty, both in plan and in execution. This judgment seems necessary, however, when we examine the work in detail. If the book did not bear evident marks of elaboration we should ascribe many statements therein to carelessness; if the editor had not been teaching Greek at Amherst College for a quarter of a century, many errors would be ascribed to ignorance. On 806 he translates Πλούτωνος πόνρον as 'the ford of Pluto'; spoiling the sense gratuitously, for no translation is needed in the note. He writes, on 725, of the Amazons who 'shall inhabit Themiscyra about Thermodon,' where few boys would imagine that 'Thermodon' was a river, on the banks of which the Amazons were to dwell. An error so inexcusable that we must ascribe it to the demon of the press, although it more closely resembles a freshman's blunder, is in the note on 452; κατ'ὥρυχες is translated "burrows or dugout." The printer's devil clearly took this word for a noun.

The editor drops into etymologies occasionally, but generally is unfortunate. Sometimes he drags in an etymology against his will. Thus on σφίγγε, v. 58, he is led to mention the Sphinx, and proceeds to connect that word with the English *fax*, referring to Curtius. But Curtius dropped this as untenable at least as early as the last edition of his "Etymology," in 1879. The editor forgets the Attic use of παρελθεῖν, and neglects the natural contrast with the Exodos, when he says that the Parodos of the chorus was so named "because the chorus entered from the side of the stage." On 733 he says that Βόσπορος is "properly Ox-ford," but at once "hedges" by adding, not quite clearly, that "probably this derivation is confined to Aeschylus, and has no philological connection with the myth of Io; for in all other compounds of βοῦς the diphthong is retained."

A characteristic note is that on v. 680: "Argus was killed by Hermes with a stone, who was from this exploit called 'Αργεῖφόντης. Hera placed Argus' hundred eyes in the tail of a peacock. This tradition as well as that concerning the manner of his death goes to show that the whole story was symbolically connected with the peacock, the sacred bird of India." It is unnecessary to remind the readers of this Journal how distinctly the drift of philological opinion has led toward the belief that this byname of Hermes had nothing to do with Argus. It would have been better for the editor to have said nothing about "a stone," for the form of the myth according to which Hermes killed Argus with his sword, seems to have been at least as prevalent. What the editor adds about the peacock's tail might better have been reserved for the class-room. That the peacock is the "sacred bird of India" seems to be untrue. Moreover, the Argus-myth does not deserve to be called a "tradition." Of this note, then, only the first five words are true and in their right place.

Another unfortunate note is that on 458, where the editor speaks of "the difficulty of distinguishing between the true setting of a star and its apparent or heliacal setting, when, by its nearness to the sun, it is rendered invisible by its superior brightness." The confusion here is all in the editor's mind; in themselves, the heliacal and the daily settings cannot be confounded. The editor's mistake is the less excusable since he refers to Blakesley's Herodotus (a book which is in the hands of few students), where the matter is clearly stated.

The editor not infrequently strays from the point which is to be explained or illustrated. When Oceanus says, v. 290, that the tie of blood constrains him to sympathize with the misfortunes of Prometheus, the editor tells us: "The laws of kinship were very binding. The plots of many of the Greek tragedies are based on the principle that children must avenge the wrongs of their parents." So on 129: "These archaic forms [of the Doric dialect] had been so long used in choral worship that the Greeks came to love the dialect as essential to the service, and hence insisted on retaining it; just as the Ephesians preferred the ugly old idol in their great temple of Artemis to the finest statue of the goddess completed in later times, and as some persons at the present day consider it almost profanation to correct even the grammatical errors in King James' version of the Bible." And again, on the same page: "This training by Oceanus of his children to be retiring and respectful is quite in contrast with certain modern manners of the young." The crowning absurdity into which the editor is led by his desire to make a chatty text-book is his note on v. 91, where the mention of the sun suggests the idea of sun-worship (which was not in the mind of Aeschylus), and this leads him to the statue of the sun-god at Rhodes, "the Colossus, seventy feet high, that bestrode the harbor." The harbor of Rhodes is not far from 700 feet wide at the narrowest part, and it would have been interesting if Professor Mather had added an illustration of his "Colossus, seventy feet high," bestriding it. The use of *feet* for *cubits* probably was a slip of the pen. If the editor's imagination had been stronger, it would have served him here in good stead. The imperfect development of his representative faculty has led him to other ludicrous positions. He tells us, on v. 561, that it is impossible to decide positively whether Io was represented upon the stage as "a heifer with a woman's head, furnished with horns, or simply as a woman with horns." But he reminds us that "the

Athenians did not hesitate to make the hideous, revolting centaurs prominent in the noblest art," and that on a bas-relief, Io was represented as changed into a cow. He elsewhere speaks of her "revolting form," and we see that he thinks it at least possible that the actor who had played the part of Oceanus came in as a quadruped and curveted over the stage like a calf. He cuts himself off from refuge to the view that the quadruped may not have frisked about, by saying in the Introduction, p. xxxvii, that "the frantic efforts of Io to get away from her tormentor would seem to require more room for the performance of her part than the limits of a small balcony would furnish." His argument from the centaurs is without point, since we are not informed of their introduction upon the tragic stage. He does not seem to have borne in mind the boundary lines between the drama and painting and sculpture, an oblivion which is the more peculiar since he has lectured, we believe, in the School of Art at Smith College. We are tempted to believe that the editor's conception of Io as a cow led him to his interpretation of the exclamation of the chorus after the recital of Io's sufferings, v. 687, *ἔα ἔα, ἀπεχε, φεῦ*, which he translates "*keep (her) off.*" Evidently these maidens share the well-known fear of their sex for *horned cattle*, and it seems to be hard fate which leaves them no male protector except Prometheus, chained to the rock. This shows that Aeschylus had studied carefully the feminine mind. The editor's comment on this exclamation is only slightly different: "This is addressed to *Pro.* by the chorus, whose purity is shocked by the story of Io, and they wish to avoid all contact with such an accursed creature." It is the editor and not the poet who speaks of the "sin of Io."


The editor's language is often inexact. He gives the name *stichomythy* to the dialogue between Kratos and Hephaestus, where he himself remarks that "it will be observed that Hephaestus confines himself to a single verse *while Kratos employs two.*" He offends mortally against good taste by always abbreviating the name Prometheus to *Pro.* We have not chanced to find a passage where this has saved any space.

A note on Dodona, on v. 830, occupies more than half a page. The editor's authority for the site is Col. Leake, whose *Travels* were published in 1835, who believed the site of the ancient oracle to be at the southern extremity of the lake Janina. Professor Mather evidently is ignorant of the excavations conducted several years ago by Carapanos, whose elaborate account of them in two volumes was published in 1878. Nearly fifty inscriptions pertaining to the oracle, most of them being questions addressed to Zeus and Dione, leave no doubt that the oracle was situated on a projecting knoll, near the middle of the valley of Tcharacovista. A dozen miles one way or another in the position of Dodona make little difference to the college student, but the perhaps groundless suspicion is excited that the scholar who has never heard of the discoveries there is not well read in modern philological literature and may not be prepared to make a satisfactory edition of a Greek play. We are reminded that Professor Mather edited some selections from Herodotus about ten years ago and repeated there, on Hdt. VII 213, the old view that the Amphictyonic Council met in the spring at Delphi and in the autumn at Thermopylae; while inscriptions found at Delphi, and the Funeral Oration of Hyperides, which was discovered in an Egyptian tomb, proved years before to the general satisfaction of scholars

that the Council in both spring and fall met at Thermopylae, its original seat, and then proceeded to Delphi. This error has been repeated since Professor Mather's publication by two other American editors.

Seldom are so many philological errors brought together and soberly enunciated as on some of the pages of the introduction, on the representation of Greek plays. The editor has much delightful knowledge. He knows to a foot the width of the middle door of the stage and the exact arrangement of the mask and mouthpiece. He knows that the stage was provided with a curtain and how it was managed. He tells us that the plays of Euripides required frequent change of scene. But unfortunately he is not always consistent. On p. xx he says that the poet "more than compensated" for the simplicity of the plot of the Prometheus, and for the lack of action, "by the wild grandeur of the scenery," etc., while on p. xxxiv we read that "the stage illusions must have been very imperfect. In such large open-air amphitheatres [*sic*] they used scenery simply to suggest the interpretation of the play, expecting the imagination of the spectators to supply the rest." Why the editor's pen should have slipped into the word *amphitheatres* it is not easy to see.

The editor avoids everything that savors of scholarship; he gives no parallel passages for illustration, even on *πρὸς κέντρα κῶλον ἐκτενείς* merely referring to Acts ix. 5. He dodges the question of the marriage of the nymphs, v. 901, and does not explain the allusion to the trident of Poseidon, v. 925, which ought to be illustrated from Pindar's eighth Isthmian Ode. In general, he wisely avoids the mention of the names of scholars who have edited this play. When he breaks this rule, the result is sometimes disastrous, as on 887: "Paley and Wecklein refer here to the proverb said to have originated with Pittacus of Mytilene, *τὴν κατὰ σάντον ἔλα.*" This reference to the Englishman and German shows that the editor did not know that they took the note from the later *scholiast*; and on 560 his expression, "in *Buttmann's Scholia*," etc., implies that his study of the old commentators has been superficial.

Curiously enough, the treatment of the lyric parts of the Prometheus in this volume is not by Professor Mather, but "by an arrangement of the publisher," the metrical introduction and schemes were prepared by Professor Gould, on the system of J. H. H. Schmidt. The notation is the most convenient, and teachers will be glad of these schemes, although they may be unwilling to adopt unreservedly the principle of eurhythm which is made so prominent here. The metrical editor seems to differ from Professor Mather in his interpretation of one passage. One line, v. 117, *ἵκετο θερμόνιον ἐπὶ πάγον*, is severely strained to make it bacchiac, while little if anything is gained by this treatment. It is probably a misprint which, in the definition of the cyclic dactyl, p. 131, makes it equal to .

A teacher with this edition might make his recitations interesting and profitable, sharpening on the notes the critical faculties of his class. For this use, probably undesigned by the editor, the book seems well fitted. Otherwise it is not adapted to class-room use. It assumes that the student has no teacher or, at least, receives no instruction, and it anticipates the work of the class-room so far as the editor can. To a student who reads the play without a teacher, this edition gives much that is interesting, combined with various errors.